United Nations A/C.2/55/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
29 September 2000

Original: English

Fifty-fifth session
Second Committee
Agenda item 95 (d)
Environment and sustainable development: further implementation of the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States

Letter dated 26 September 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Samoa to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to write in my capacity as Chairman of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) and to refer to the Second AOSIS Workshop on Climate Change, Negotiations, Management and Strategy, which was held in Apia from 26 July to 4 August 2000.

In this regard, I have been requested by the States members of AOSIS to seek your assistance in having the report of the workshop (see annex)* circulated as a document of the General Assembly under agenda item 95 (d). The list of participants for the workshop can be found at the following SIDS/net web site: www.sidsnet.org/workshop/apia_participants.html.

(*Signed*) Tuiloma Neroni **Slade**
Ambassador/Permanent Representative
Chairman of the Alliance of Small Island States

* The annex is being circulated in the language of submission only.

00-66542 (E) 051000

Annex to the letter dated 26 September 2000 from the Permanent Representative of Samoa to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

Report of the 2nd Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) workshop on climate change negotiations, management and strategy

The second workshop of the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) on climate change negotiations, management and strategy was held in Apia, Samoa, from 26 July to 4 August, 2000, under the auspices of the Government of Samoa. It was organized by the Alliance of Small Island States (AOSIS) in cooperation with the Division for Sustainable Development of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UNDESA). The workshop was generously sponsored by the Government of Italy, with the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) providing substantial travel support to a number of participants.

PROCEEDINGS

The opening session of the workshop, held on 26 July and chaired by H.E. Dr. John W. Ashe, representing the Delegation of Antigua and Barbuda, which serves as Vice-Chairman of AOSIS, began with a prayer from Lupematasila Uele Vaaulu, President of Pesega Central Stake, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints. H.E. The Honorable Matatauali'itia Afa Lesa, Samoa's Acting Minister of Lands and Environment, delivered the featured address and formally declared the workshop open. The Minister underscored the importance of AOSIS as the umbrella group of small island developing States (SIDS), and highlighted the need for SIDS to work together on issues such as climate change, in an effort to develop common solutions and the maximize the opportunities to learn from each other. He requested participants to further explore these critical issues in the course of the workshop. He added that AOSIS must continue its active engagement in the various international processes, and that the group should build up its core expertise to assist its Member States in related negotiations at the international level. He concluded by quoting from one of the Member States' Constitution, that ... "while an ocean lies between our islands, it does not separate us, it unites us."

UNDP'S Resident Representative and Resident Coordinator of the United Nations in Samoa, Mr. Serge Ducasse, also delivered a welcoming address. He noted that, as a sponsor of the workshop, UNDP is stressing its commitment to assist SIDS in their efforts to cope with climate change and to better understand its impacts. He emphasized that AOSIS as a group must be enabled and assisted in seeking the solutions to and directions for the issues related to climate change.

The keynote address was delivered by the Chairman of AOSIS, H.E. Ambassador Tuiloma Neroni Slade of Samoa. He outlined some of the tasks that lay ahead for participants and stressed the importance of the cooperative spirit that has led AOSIS to make meaningful contributions to the international debate on sustainable development in general and climate change in particular. He expressed the hope that the workshop would enhance the depth and knowledge of the issues for the participants and that they in turn would disseminate, either through SIDSNet or through national consultations, the knowledge gained to their colleagues who were unable to participate.

NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

Discussions on the national communications on climate change were conducted over four sessions. The first session dealing with presentations on national communications on climate change by the national coordinators, was chaired by Mr. Tuuu Ieti Taulealo, Director, Ministry of Lands and Environment of Samoa. Introductory remarks were made by Mr. Yamil Bonduki of the UNDP. The Chairman then posed a series of questions of the national coordinators, which was followed by an in-depth discussion amongst the participants on the various aspects of the national communications process. The discussion was broadened to include regional aspects and possible areas for cooperation. Statements were made by Barbados, Cook Islands, Bahamas, Marshall Islands, Jamaica, Mauritius, Vanuatu, Trinidad and Tobago, Seychelles, Nauru, Saint Lucia, Fiji, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Tuvalu, Grenada, Cuba and Samoa. The participants were then divided into two working groups, one representing the Pacific Islands, while the other consisted of participants from the Caribbean and others regions of AOSIS. Each working group then made a number of recommendations on the priority issues identified in the discussions. The main findings of the two working groups are attached as an annex to this report.

Mr. Rolph Payet, Director General of the Ministry of Environment and Transport of Seychelles, chaired the second session, which dealt with the recommendations of the two working groups. Participants discussed further the recommendations of the two working groups and recommended those points agreed to by consensus to the plenary of the workshop. Statements were made by Cuba, Mauritius, Jamaica, Federated States of Micronesia, Bahamas, Samoa, Palau, Niue and the representative of the UNDP.

The third session, which discussed the national communications process itself, was chaired by Mr. Phillip Weech, Chairman of the National Climate Change Committee, Bahamas Environment, Science and Technology Commission. Participants were given an overview of the regional approach utilized in the Pacific Island Climate Change Assistance Program. Mr. Wayne King, Manager, PICCAP, South Pacific Regional Environment Program, explained the benefits of the regional approach while also highlighting the difficulties encountered along the way. Professor Albert Binger, DIRECTOR OF THE University of the West Indies Center for Environment and Development (UWICED) gave an overview of the Caribbean experience and how this had resulted in a somewhat different approach under the Caribbean Preparing for Adaptation to Global Climate Change (CPACC) program. Statements were made by Antigua and Barbuda, Palau, Jamaica, Seychelles, Marshall Islands, Vanuatu, Federated States of Micronesia, SPREP, UNFCCC Secretariat, and UNDP.

The fourth session was chaired by H.E. Ambassador Tuiloma Neroni Slade, Chairman of AOSIS. Participants both elaborated and consolidated the various elements that had been raised in the working groups and in the ensuing discussion. Statements were made by Tuvalu, Federated States of Micronesia, Palau, Antigua and Barbuda, Saint Lucia, Seychelles, Cook Islands, Niue, Mauritius, Trinidad and Tobago, Marshall Islands, SIDSNet, SPREP, IGCI, PacNews and Greenpeace. Participants agreed to the recommendation of the chairman that the "secretariat" should reproduce and distribute the recommendations on national communications for consideration by at a subsequent plenary meeting of the workshop. The representative of UNDP made a

closing remark. The Chairman, on behalf of AOSIS, thanked the UNDP for their support and in particular for the assistance given by the UNDP National Communications Support Program.

GEF CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

The opening session under this agenda item was chaired by Mr. Joseph Konno, Director, Environmental Protection Agency, Chuuk State Government, Federated States of Micronesia. Introductory remarks were made by H.E. Ambassador Tuiloma Neroni Slade, followed by a detailed description of the background to the CDI by Professor Binger of UWICED, in his capacity as the consultant for the preparation of the SIDS input to the GEF'S Capacity Development Initiative (CDI). Dr. Walter Vermuellen also presented a paper on capacity issues in the area of land degradation in Samoa, while Mr. Tepa Suaesi and Dr. Eletise Suluvale covered biodiversity and climate change respectively. Mr. Rawleston Moore from Barbados discussed the capacity development issues both from the perspective of Barbados as well as from the Caribbean as a region. Mr. Neville Koop, Director of Pacific Ocean and Atmosphere Consultants, made a presentation on capacity needs in the Pacific, based on his experiences in SPREP and with the meteorological services of the region. Luc Chang-Ko also made a presentation on issues pertaining to capacity development from the perspective of the Indian Ocean SIDS. Audrey Dropsey of SPREP made a presentation on a survey that SPREP have carried out on the effectiveness of training that has been offered so far in the context of various projects and programs. Statements were made by representatives from Palau, Tonga, Samoa, Vanuatu, Grenada, SPREP, and the University of the South Pacific.

The second session was devoted to discussions in inter-regional Working Groups and the results of these discussions were transmitted by the chairmen of the inter-regional working groups to the third session chaired by H.E. Ambassador Tuiloma Neroni Slade. The recommendations which were agreed to by consensus were then reproduced by the "secretariat" and distributed to participants. The Chairman, on behalf of AOSIS, through Professor Binger, thanked the GEF for their support and in particular for the assistance given by Professor Binger during the workshop.

CLIMATE CHANGE NEGOTIATIONS, MANAGEMENT AND STRATEGY

The first session under this agenda item was chaired by H.E. Ambassador Tuiloma Neroni Slade. He introduced the topics to be discussed, and then gave an opportunity to the representative of the UNFCCC Secretariat, Mrs. Clare Parker, to give an overview of the road to UNFCCC'S COP6, to be held in the Hague in November 2000. A statement was made by the Head of Delegation of Italy, H.E. Ambassador Mario Sica, who spoke on the willingness of Italy to cooperate with AOSIS Members. He assured the participants of the preparedness of the Italian delegates to contribute to the deliberations and to answer any questions regarding the possibilities for joint efforts with Italian institutions. He emphasized the interest of Italy in issues such as capacity building, research and training, and the need to support small and medium sized enterprises. Ambassador Slade, speaking on behalf of AOSIS, thanked the Italian Government for their very generous support to the workshop.

Wayne King of SPREP highlighted the experiences gained in capacity building from the accumulation of views and reports in the PICCAP project, and identified the adaptation needs of the Pacific SIDS. He emphasized that the special needs of the Pacific SIDS are present in all stages of the process of the preparation of their national communications, and underscored the fact that the country team approach was key to a successful process at the national level. He added that as a result of this approach, the national communications produced through PICCAP have enhanced cooperative national team efforts, and inclusive of all stakeholders in the process.

In the discussions that followed, specific issues emerged on adaptation among the country teams and among the national coordinators. While adaptation options had not yet been distinctly defined, there were plenty of tasks ahead for the country teams. Many indicated that what was really required were better tools to measure change, and to demonstrate vulnerabilities to the domestic audience. Indicators of change on for example coral reefs and mangroves were seen as important in order to reach a wide range of stakeholders. Knowledge of adaptation options was still limited and the Pacific region in particular was just beginning to look at policy development and implementation strategies for how to move into the next phases of vulnerability assessment and adaptation. The national coordinators seem agreed to the need for pilot projects and workplans for scoping out adaptation projects. SPREP have suggested that the concept of an adaptation "toolbox" be developed, that would combine awareness with professional and technical training, and would also include regional models.

Mr. Brett Orlando from IUCN presented some views on how the ecosystem approach could assist countries in studying vulnerability and in reaching adaptation solutions. He noted that the renewed impetus to adaptation in the FCCC process, and the future establishment of the adaptation fund under the CDM meant that countries like the AOSIS Members would have to reach new levels of understanding in order to benefit from the possibilities. The ecosystem approach, he added, would seek to set a strategy in place for maintaining and enhancing the value of ecological goods and services, and to promote adaptive management of the ecosystem. Learning by doing was highlighted as a positive contribution, as was decentralization of the management process. He concluded by noting that the main outcome should be to set up practical mechanisms for transferring information and expertise to the stakeholders, to develop partnerships and to ensure that the communities participate fully.

Professor John Hay of IGCI addressed the need to have effective links between science and the development of policy, and that the supporting input from the international negotiations process must also be channeled to the right levels of Government. He noted that while science driven policy is the preferred option, much of the international negotiations have ended up with policy driving science. He also spoke about the very serious threats to the SIDS that were being investigated by scientists on the IPCC. He added that while there are still some uncertainties about the direct effects on specific communities, it is likely that the impacts of increasing extreme events would take a high toll on the SIDS. Finally, he concluded that it is essential to begin integrated assessments of vulnerable areas and sectors in SIDS, and to ensure that appropriate technologies and know-how is transferred to SIDS, and that climate change also needs to be mainstreamed into national sustainable development planning.

In the ensuing discussion, Bahamas, Guyana, Samoa, Palau, Jamaica, Italy, Cape Verde, Federated States of Micronesia, SIDSNet, SPREP and WWF made statements.

The second session was chaired by Ms. I'o Tuakeu-Lindsay, Director of the Environment Service of Cook Islands. Participants continued the discussion of the issue of adaptation to climate change, in particular on the next steps for the negotiations.

Mr. Rawleston Moore of Barbados chaired the third session, which focused on national communications and the tasks ahead for the country teams. Taholo Kami (SIDSNet) made a presentation on future steps for SIDSNet. He enumerated the various problems such as data collection, at national and regional levels, and the difficulties encountered in sharing data with the global level. Improvement is needed in the software available for the collection of data in SIDS. He highlighted the need to establish which agencies or offices are doing what tasks, to finding the opportunities, and the publicity. He noted that not only are SIDS doing more checking but also the research organizations of the developed countries. He reminded participants that SIDSNet affords SIDS with the opportunity to have their stakeholders as the best informed, and that the donors are informed. He concluded that SIDSNet is looking at standardization of information, and to establishing AOSIS standards for how we collect information and sharing, for example online agendas, presentations, etc, which would allow for access to meetings of those WHO cannot attend, and give much better basis for future work.

Prof. Richard Warrick (IGCI) presented a paper on strategies for vulnerability and adaptation assessments in the context of national communications. He indicated that while the ideal situation for SIDS would be to carry out a full scale technical vulnerability and adaptation study, SIDS have done parallel vulnerability and adaptation statements instead, and these have been resulting in workplans and scoping reports. He noted that these provide the grist for the mill of national communications. He stressed the need to put in place an ongoing process, and cautioned that asking IPCC to change guidelines is not the necessary point. Rather it may be better for SIDS to continue with the process of vulnerability and adaptation statements and scoping out possible pilot projects may provide better input in the short and medium term. Adaptation can also be seen as a process, comprising six components, such as capacity building, adaptation assessments, awareness raising as part of incorporating adaptation in the national planning, mainstreaming of adaptation, and inclusion of monitoring and evaluation over time. He stressed that greater attention should be paid to the human dimension. He concluded that adaptation is process that must be incorporated into the national planning.

A presentation on natural disasters, climate change and sustainable development: from theory to practice, WAS MADE by Claudio Margottini (Italy). It cautioned that the economic strengths of Italy increased the resilience to natural disasters, and emphasized that the interaction between different disasters shows this to clearly be the case. Mitigation as well as prevention has been considered in the Italian context. Numerous studies, such as one carried out on sea level rise, looked at the velocity of the sea changes. This was highlighted as being of particular interest to the participants. It was stressed that it was especially important to establish a national approach that is useful to the process at the international level. A practical example

was the development of hazard maps, which many SIDS have stated as being sorely needed.

Participants discussed the information and raised numerous questions in light of the presentations, including on the establishment of regional centers in AOSIS regions. Statements were made by Mauritius, Samoa, Barbados, Palau, Guyana, Grenada, Jamaica, Papua New Guinea, Cuba, Marshall Islands, Saint Lucia, Vanuatu, Fiji, Trinidad and Tobago, Federated States of Micronesia, Cape Verde, Seychelles, Cyprus, Italy, SPREP and UNEP.

The fourth session was chaired by Dr. Renuka Padarath of the Meteorological Service of Mauritius. The discussions focused on capacity building needs, and revisited some of the points from the discussions under the Capacity Development Initiative.
A paper on the GEF and responsiveness to SIDS was presented by Mr. Gerald Miles (SPREP), who stated that being responsive and being effective are different things. He spoke of the lessons learned, from the days of the pilot phase and then on to the priorities laid out by the BPOA. On the GEF project cycle, he noted that assistance available through the grants from the GEF's project development facility (PDF) had been helpful. Since the GEF constituency arrangement was based on the World Bank structure, the arrangement allowed for all the Pacific SIDS to be grouped together. However, for some SIDS regions this could not be so easily achieved. He bemoaned the lengthy, time-consuming consultations that were necessary in the Pacific, noting that the costs of these regional consultations are quite high, making it more costly to work on the regional basis. Nevertheless, the Pacific SIDS have made clear their preference to work together as a group. Clearly then the Pacific Governments are getting access to GEF funds, but they need to do more and be more proactive.
He further noted that the transparency of tracking the projects is not easy. And when the project takes 3 years to set up, with life span of 3 years, the difficulties are apparent. Country teams do build capacity at the national level. Capacity building remains essential. Focal point training is ongoing and requires further usage.
Technical support to SIDS representatives on the GEF could be done in a more concerted way.

Participants heard a presentation on main topics for a program on information and public awareness by Dr. Vincenzo Ferrara (Italy), who detailed the programmatic components required. He also highlighted the areas in which cooperation with Italy might be available to AOSIS, either as individual countries or as regional groups. A discussion on the target groups for information and public education and awareness was started by this presentation and continued throughout the workshop.

A presentation was also made on non-linear analysis, forecasting and chemical monitoring: formation and training of researchers by Antonello Pasini (Italy),who suggested that training be held for AOSIS staff at Italian institutes with further coursework done in one or more of the SIDS.

Brett Orlando presented a paper on capacity building, based on work that has been carried out by IUCN. He informed participants that it was one of IUCN's main areas of work, and that the organization was seeking to respond to the COP6 decision. He added that, since capacity building has not been explicitly defined in the convention or elsewhere, it is at least formulated in agenda 21, in a variety of ways. He noted that

capacity building must be country driven; address country-specific needs; build on what is already available, and develop endogenous capacity. It is also an iterative process that must be sustainable. Some ad hoc activities in the past have been successful but then not followed up. A large number of stakeholders need to be involved and should also include NGOs. In the process the NGOs do play a very useful role. In the national communications, the effort often stops after the submission of the formal communication, and it is clear that the process must continue beyond that stage – which is an avenue for countries to begin using NGOs to assist.

Luc Chang-Ko (Seychelles) presented views from the Indian Ocean SIDS, in the areas of public education, training and awareness. He noted that these were seen as the most effective ways to get people to change their ways of behavior. Lack of strategic look at planning and guidance or any central government policy in this regard has often hampered progress. He pointed out that there is a gap between the climate change process and the necessary national responses to it, and highlighted the difficulties in making these issues acceptable to the population. The focus on climate change education shows that it is better to have a sustained effort and hence a better way of looking at the issues. It is important to cover all bases such as in taking actions and suggesting solutions for people. The aim is to develop a strategic approach with the media, and have a workshop for the policy makers. Other important issues raised included climate change information and research centers. SIDS must be enabled to look at sustainable development and related environment activities that can take care of their further needs under the convention.

Statements were made by representatives from the Seychelles, Tonga, Cyprus, Samoa, Palau and Guyana.

The session chaired by H.E. Ambassador Robert Van Lierop, former Permanent Representative of Vanuatu to the United Nations and the 1st Chairman of AOSIS (1990-1993) was very lively. The session discussed recent scientific findings and heard a presentation on sinks, the IPCC TAR, and other SIDS research to by Ian Fry (Tuvalu). He described the IPCC special report on land use change and forestry, and made a general introduction to the carbon cycle. He also related the several articles of the convention and the protocol, as they became relevant to sinks in the discussion. He stated that sinks are being considered within the discussion of assigned amounts of the Annex I Parties. He urged AOSIS to give due consideration to any transfers such as joint implementation, the EU bubble and emissions trading, and noted that it is also relevant to discuss sinks in the context of the compliance issue. He observed that Article 3.3 of the Kyoto Protocol had number of implications, and that the key wording of the Article was ppen for interpretation. He noted the fact that it was necessary to be aware of the implications, since article 3.3 refers to carbon stock changes only during commitment period. This has great potential to lead to a perverse incentive to some parties to clear-cut forests before 2008 and take credits for reforestation in between 2008 and 2012. He expressed concern that the different definitions of a "forest" that was taken some time by certain countries caused great many loopholes for the Protocol, and he explained how using canopy cover raises multiple problems. He noted that Article 3.4 of the Protocol causes its own complications, as some countries wanted to put in their own definitions, such as forest fertilization, and storage in wood houses, thereby allowing the use of article 3.4 to increase a country's ability to add sinks. While conceding that under the Convention

and in the Protocol, Annex I Parties will have to account for the sinks, he questioned whether or not the figures presented were accurate, and cited as proof the variation in figures reported by some parties to the convention. He also explained the difference with non-Annex I sinks in that these do not have to be accounted for by the developing countries. He also discussed the issues of leakage, permanence to guarantee the longevity of a sink project, and secondary or ancillary emissions within the projects, and emphasized that very cheap forestry projects discourage renewable energy projects. He concluded by noting that some Annex I parties contend that they can only ratify the protocol if sinks are included in the clean development mechanism (article 12 of the Protocol), while others have stated that they need breathing space to develop mitigation options. He felt that since Annex I parties have until 2012 to meet the requirements this should be sufficient, and urged the developing countries not to look at the sinks projects in the CDM as a way to make money.

Mr. F. Tubiello (Italy), who described a joint project that has been under development with NASA and Italy, presented a further paper on science and adaptation. In looking at spatial considerations and agricultural influences that climate change can cause, he presented a finding of the research that showed that CO2 is increasing beyond its natural concentrations. There are two global circulation models in current use and these were utilized by the US national study. GCMs can provide some insights, but are not perfect tools. CO2 can have some positive effects on the agricultural growth but there are limits to benefits as some weeds may grow faster. Higher temperatures may also have some beneficial effects on higher altitude agriculture. Yield will be reduced in other places because of a shorter maturation time. Other effects are also detrimental such as flooding and extreme precipitation events. It matters to countries to get a good understanding of these issues due to the possible extreme losses in agricultural production that can be caused by climate change and extreme events. Statements were made by representatives from Palau, Mauritius, Vanuatu, Bahamas, Guyana, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Jamaica, Comoros, Suriname, Tuvalu, Barbados, Italy, USP, SPREP, WWF and IUCN.

The sixth session was chaired by H.E. Ambassador Tuiloma Neroni Slade, during which discussions began on "mechanisms" of the Kyoto Protocol. Jurgen Lefevere of FIELD and Jennifer Morgan of WWF made presentations on a number of issues that had arisen in the context of the international negotiations. Statements were made representatives from Cyprus, Vanuatu, Saint Lucia, Marshall Islands, Maldives, SPREP and POAC.

The seventh session, which was chaired by Mr. Kishan Kumarsingh, of the Environmental Management Authority of Trinidad and Tobago, was devoted to the issue of compliance under the Kyoto Protocol. Professor Jake Werksman of FIELD and Jennifer Morgan of WWF presented a paper on the framework within which a compliance regime COULD work. They noted that the challenge is to bring a compliance framework into force. There are some milestones in the process, which hails back to the INC decision of the General Assembly in 1990. The sub group on compliance, originally chaired by Ambassador Van Lierop during the INC phase, was later upgraded to a full-fledged body known as the AG13 during the Berlin Mandate process. One conclusion of that group dealing with the ratio of size and composition of the decision making body is still unresolved. Article 16 of the KP states that the AG13 might play a role in the compliance, but the focus is mainly on article 18. It has

been suggested that it should be looking at facilitative procedures rather than punitive or legalistic alone. Cases of non-compliance will be followed up, but there is still the issue of enforcement of compliance. It is also clear that the obligations are on Annex 1, but there is still an interest for AOSIS. Thus in the global perspective there is a need for AOSIS to keep the protocol and its integrity central, and merely assist the market forces that will drive a healthy mechanisms process.

Some developing countries are worried that the regime will be too intrusive, and so the role of the system vis-à-vis developing countries must be clarified. The primary role of the system must be to prevent over emission. Second, it must prevent over selling. Third, the regime must ensure additionality, and hence seek to avoid leakage. The compliance system should provide the advice, and assistance in following up on the rules. The practical functioning will have Expert Review Teams, a Compliance Body and Secretariat support. The national communications give a lot of opportunity for Annex 1 to give a rosy picture of the emissions profiles and scenarios. To prevent this one has to enforce the IPCC rules. If the ERT finds that there is a discrepancy then the system should look at replacing that data. The system should also result in certain consequences that can be seen as binding. There seems to be agreement that a panel of enforcement experts to put these procedures into action. But the question remains as to who can trigger the procedure, and this is still an ongoing debate, especially as far as the range of issues to be considered.
During the subsequent discussions, statements were made representatives from the Marshall Islands, Bahamas, Saint Lucia, Palau, Guyana, Tuvalu, Jamaica, Samoa, Kiribati, Italy, SPREP and POAC.

There was also a presentation by Sergio Castellari on a proposal for a Pacific Climate Change Bulletin. The intention is to establish a training function with SPREP funded by Italian Government, that would go beyond the current work on the former US territories and associated States put out by the PEAC. They will look at the production of education materials, summaries and predictions, as well as climate diagnostic materials for looking at the predictions. They will also collect meteorological data, and make threat awareness more available to the SIDS in the Pacific. Located on the SPREP web page, it will run for 18 months. In the ensuing discussion it was clarified that a similar function could be made available to the other Members of AOSIS through appropriate regional bodies or institutions. A request to this effect appeared likely.

A closed meeting of the AOSIS coordinators was also held.

The eighth session was chaired by H.E. Ambassador Tuiloma Neroni Slade. The session was a preparatory meeting for the 3rd AOSIS Workshop (to be held in Cyprus 2001), which will be devoted to the issues of climate change, energy and the 9th session of the CSD. After a brief introduction by the Chairman, Mr. Espen Ronneberg (United Nations) presented the relevant texts from the Barbados Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of SIDS, the outcome of the 22nd special session of the UNGA, and the energy related provisions therein. This was followed by a review and assessment of the BPOA, the outcome of the 22nd special session of the UNGA, and perspective on future sustainable energy paths for SIDS, with considerations of some Caribbean perspectives, by Prof. Albert Binger (UWI – Jamaica). He spoke of the enormous gaps in social spending caused by the cyclic nature of the SIDS

economy, and which forces the edges of the economy to deplete the resources. 85% of all emissions are energy related, as climate change is clearly an energy-related problem. The knock on effects for SIDS are very great. He explained his views on the need to shift into a new energy services paradigm – efficiency of production and use. This should take into account the resources that are available to SIDS, but which are under-utilized – solid waste, sewage, sugar factories and other agricultural waste products, etc. There is also a need to look at combining the agriculture and energy sectors. Also, there is a lot of waste heat is lost, and opportunities are often not captured by industries. The other resource available to SIDS, which we only think to throw cameras into, is the ocean. The thermal energy in the tropical ocean is not being tapped and is of great potential. OTEC can well meet all our energy needs except for transport and aviation. Biomass can be used in production of plant oils. Test case of the pilot cooking stove. He said that the bottom line is the maximum use of our own resources. We do need to change our local transportation patterns, and to avoid the local costs as well as the emissions.

Anare Matakiviti (SOPAC – Fiji) presented the outcomes of some work currently underway by SOPAC on energy usage in the Pacific region. The capacity and the dependence on fossil fuel energy is different across the region, but is still the major fuel source in the Pacific. There are difficulties in extending the grid, and in getting energy to villages at an affordable cost. Use of appropriate technologies to the rural level is also problematic. He called on other partners in the energy sector, such as the investment banks, and to get energy efficiency into industrial applications, get the utilities to address demand side management. He raised the question of the lack of appropriate power sectors, and the lack of international support that is needed. Improving fossil fuel usage is important, but so is the move into other forms of generation. It was important to bear in mind the issue of meeting the energy needs of the people for the future.

Dr. Renuka Padarath (Mauritius) presented a paper on the energy perspectives of the Indian Ocean SIDS. The energy strategies relate to the heavy costs for the economies of fossil fuels. There appears be consensus across regions that there is a need to increase use of renewable energy and to seek pilot projects in wind power and hydro. He described a prudent path to address climate change together with energy and sustainable development. Acquiring knowledge and pursuing policies that leads to sustainable development, but most of all it will lead to self-reliance, in and among SIDS, were seen as crucial elements.

Mr. P. Menne (Italy) presented a paper on energy production and saving, hybrid electric power plants and renewable energy systems, and on capacity building. He spoke of a case study on the renewable sector in SIDS, and mentioned the energy farm concept. The farm concept is intended to use the biomass and waste from agriculture and livestock. The application of island projects has been set up in Mediterranean. The emphasis has been on shifting the focus over to other fuels, and to look into combined projects with hybrid systems and multiple benefits.
A further project, the Islands Project, which aims to look at reducing the impact on isolated communities, was also detailed. This is a hybrid energy systems project of particular interest to SIDS. The cost of transportation of the fuel adds another level of costs to the diesel generation. As such the up-front costs are the pivotal ones. Interest

rates could drive the investment, if we were able to get the savings properly accounted for.

In the discussion that followed, statements were made representatives from Samoa, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Marshall Islands, Cyprus, Vanuatu, Cook Islands, Guyana, Kiribati, Fiji, Niue and SPREP.

The Chairman, after consulting the participants, presented the final draft of the recommendations of the workshop. Preliminary comments were offered, on the understanding that a further opportunity would be given via email. The final report would then be circulated within the next week.

Participants extended a warm expression of thanks to the Samoan Government, in particular to the Ministry of Lands and Environment and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Chairman thanked the participants for their attendance and keen interest. He also thanked the sponsors of the workshop, the Government of Italy, UNDP and GEF. Before closing the meeting he also expressed the sincere gratitude of the Chairman and the participants to the "Secretariat" for its contributions to the successful outcomes of the workshop.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

1. Participants agreed that the country team approach had resulted in measurable improvements in the way that AOSIS Member States collect and disseminate data on climate change issues, and stressed the need to have this team approach formally institutionalized for purposes of continuity. They noted with appreciation the effort made by UNDP-GEF to provide "backstopping" support, through its National Communications Support Program, to assist some AOSIS countries with the preparations of their initial national communications.
2. Participants noted that human resource development as well as institutional capacity building were critical requirements for the further development of the country team approach. They also noted that the project by project basis of funding, which has been the modus operandi in the past, should be superceded by a systematic approach to capacity building within which the national communications processes could be an integral part of sustainable development.
3. Participants recalled the decision of the second Conference of the Parties to the Climate Change Convention on guidance to the financial mechanism of the Convention (GEF), which, among other things, called on the GEF to provide financial resources, upon request, to developing country Parties for the implementation of priority projects identified in their national communications. They urged AOSIS Member States to include such projects in their national communications and seek subsequent funding from the GEF for these projects.
4. Participants raised a number of concerns on coordination and capacity building, particularly as they relate to access to expertise and the sustainability of the policy framework process at the level of the national institutions. They recommended that, through SIDSNet and relevant regional organizations, the establishment of

skills banks to facilitate the exchange of information and best practices, and the development of structured training efforts, be undertaken.

5. Participants highlighted the fact that the IPCC guidelines were not entirely appropriate to AOSIS Member States and that there is a need to consult with the IPCC, in cooperation with AOSIS and regional organizations, on the development of guidelines which are more sensitive to the needs of AOSIS Member States, including the development of local emissions factors as well as regional climate scenarios to cover specific areas and sectors, as well as overall socio-economic assessments. They encouraged the IPCC, in cooperation with AOSIS and regional organizations, to explore the possibility of developing alternative assessment methods for vulnerability studies, which will enable AOSIS Member States to have a better understanding the nature and extent of adaptation issues facing them. They also urged the IPCC, in cooperation with AOSIS and regional organizations, to develop easy-to-understand guidebooks that can assist AOSIS Member States in the use of the IPCC methodologies. Participants also noted that importance of strengthening in-country skills in developing and understanding regional models and encouraged UN system, the IPCC, regional organizations and donor countries, to assist AOSIS Member States in the strengthening of these skills.

6. Participants underscored the need for public education and awareness on and community involvement and participation in climate change issues in AOSIS Member States. They noted the absence of these factors contributed to some of the difficulties encountered during the development of the national communications, and emphasized the need for widespread dissemination of relevant educational materials on the potential impacts of climate change. They recommended that, for subsequent national communications, more resources from the financial mechanism of the Convention should be made available for more in-depth public awareness and education activities and for community involvement and participation on climate change issues.

7. Participants identified information and data management as critical components that will needed by AOSIS Member States to help them fulfill their obligations under the Convention, as well as to plan for all other activities envisaged in the Convention. They stressed the need for improvement in the management and collection of data, and also the accessibility of data. To facilitate this process, participants recommended that priority should be give to the development of the national databases, as well as regional, and subregional ones, and noted that SIDSNet, in cooperation with relevant regional organizations, could serve as a mechanism for the exchange of database information amongst AOSIS Member States. In this regard, they urged that additional funding and personnel be identified and procured, from sources such as the GEF, to enable SIDSNet to carry out this function.

8. Participants called for the establishment/strengthening of regional/subregional "centers of excellence" in the focal area of climate change to enable countries to have a supportive framework, and for information retrieval. They urged the countries and regions of AOSIS to carry out assessments of their existing capacities and identify potential partners in the thematic areas of focus, to allow for the identification and subsequent establishment/strengthening of the "centers of excellence," and their appropriate roles in the national communication process.

9. Participants noted that information on the available sources of technical and financial support was not widely available, and that there was a need at the country level for central access points for data on climate change training and

other capacity needs, as well as related information on technical and financial support.

10. Participants from some regions were concerned that they were not receiving the same level of support as others and that the need for a regional support mechanism for those regions needed to be put in place. Based on the success of SPREP in the Pacific region, the workshop recommended that, in principle, the AOSIS Member States from the African and Indian Oceans regions should consider establishing formal mechanisms and/or cooperative regional arrangements, which will allow for a supporting framework for effective support, coordination and financial assistance and training. Similarly, for the AOSIS Member States in the Caribbean region, there should be a process of assessment and identification of abilities that would allow for a similar coordination effort to be put in place, bearing in mind the calls for regional centers of excellence.

CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE

1. Participants recommended that national needs assessments be initiated in the focal areas of climate change and biodiversity (and land degradation as it relates to these two areas), recognizing that countries are at different stages of such assessments. They called for the establishment, as appropriate, of national level sustainable development offices in the focal areas of the climate change and biodiversity (and land degradation as it relates to these two), and/or national commissions, councils or coordinating mechanisms for policy planning and implementation, as a matter of priority. They also underscored the need for international technical and financial support for these offices, which will also require access to ongoing training programs for further capacity development
2. Participants stressed the need for AOSIS to have country-based assessments of capacity-building needs carried out. This could include issues related to legislative matters, enforcement of existing regulations, or further issues of relevance to the countries individual needs assessment. Technical assistance to carry out these tasks is required for most, if not all, countries. They also highlighted the need to establish specific units to implement the Conventions, while ensuring that the issue of implementation and capacity needs for obligations and opportunities under the Conventions be considered in the broader terms of sustainable development. This again requires a support structure at international or regional level.
3. Participants underscored the need to ensure continuity of the GEF CDI, and cautioned against a project-by-project approach to capacity building. They identified a range of specific capacity needs that would be required, such as training in negotiation skills, resource inventory and management, and access to data and archives, and highlighted the usefulness of having training for cost benefit analysis in the public service. They also highlighted the need for the involvement of all sectors of society in the decision-making process.
4. Participants placed considerable emphasis on cross-cutting issues, looking at the three focal areas of the CDI study (climate change, biodiversity and land degradation as it relates to these two). A number of key areas were mentioned, including national needs assessments and data management, as well as the need to strengthen SIDSNet as a clearing house mechanism for the data issues such as:

Negotiation management and training in negotiations skills;

Strengthening national policy and planning processes;

Research and systematic observations and monitoring;

National and regional approaches;

Cooperation at national, subregional and regional levels, and between regional institutions;

Development and training of country teams;

Training and skill development in relevant areas;

Cultural needs, as appropriate, in country specific assessment.

5. Participants also discussed in general terms the structure of the CDI, emphasizing that, in many instances, it should seek to build on the capacity identification process already undertaken by AOSIS in the BPOA and at the 22nd Special Session of the UNGA. They emphasized the need for inclusion of science and technology needs, including geographic information systems, in the CDI.
6. Participants delineated capacity-building needs at the various levels, stressing the distinction between the need for a set of short term requirements, such as reporting skills, negotiation skills, and those which are needed from the longer term and which would involve more specific needs assessment at the national level, while recognizing the challenges countries will face in making such assessments.
7. Participants underscored the importance of the CDI as a possible tool for bringing about changes in sustainability and equity and to get sustainable development planning better institutionalized in AOSIS Member States. They also noted that the CDI could be used to set up a framework for consideration of capacity needs in countries, which took the process into areas other than climate change such as land degradation and biodiversity, while noting that sustainable development is an over-arching process that must be used as a integrative tool to bridge the gaps and create cooperative arrangements between all stakeholders (government, NGOs, private sector and civil society).
8. Participants highlighted the need for a process which will lead to the identification of effective environmental management, and improvement to these management processes by the integration of environmental concerns. However, they cautioned that the CDI should not seek to reinvent the wheel, since the BPOA has highlighted many of these issues. They stressed that the current GEF project based approach needs to be gradually replaced with a more programmatic approach that would foster sustainable development. In addition, a program-based or process-oriented approach is needed to get a sector by sector assessment as well as ongoing evaluation of the each national system.
9. Participants expressed support for the efforts to establish (in regions where they do not exists), or further strengthened (in regions where they exists) regional centers for V&A studies and other disciplines that are required in each region to tackle emerging environmental issues under the various Conventions. This would contribute to the capacity building of countries. In this regard, they called for

assistance, through the CDI, for ongoing efforts to establish and/or strengthen distance learning programs in all AOSIS regions.

10. Participants took note of the efforts of the various regional institutions to establish country-driven training programs. They highlighted the need for the CDI to assist with enhancing SIDSNet, in cooperation with relevant regional organizations, to enable it to assist countries in the exchange of information on the management and access of data and on the dissemination of information on best practices.
11. Participants further noted the need for the development of capacity through the use of regional/national experts for the national/regional training and the expanded use of cooperative arrangements amongst institutions within AOSIS Member States, in order to help bring the regional organizations into a supporting role. They also highlighted the need for assistance from the CDI to help AOSIS Member States overcome the information technology barriers to inter- and intra-regional communications.
12. Participants also recommended that regional support mechanisms are needed and "centers of excellence" were identified as a method for working on this aspect of capacity development. They invited the SIDS Unit of UNDESA, in cooperation with the AOSIS Member States and relevant regional organizations, to identify, on an urgent basis, the tasks that could be carried out by these centers, taking fully into account the mandates of the relevant regional organizations. Linkages between the centers are needed, so as to promote cost effective sharing of expertise and experience.
13. Participants urged that the decisions of the 22nd Special Session of the UNGA on the Comprehensive Review of the Barbados Programme of Action for SIDS, to be taken fully into consideration by the GEF in the further development of its CDI, in particular, the UNGA recommendations on capacity development. In this regard, the participants called for the CDI to contribute to the institutional strengthening of AOSIS, including through the establishment of a permanent secretariat, to enable it to assist its Member States with their capacity development needs.

ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE

1. Participants acknowledged that adaptation to the adverse effects of climate change remains the key challenge facing SIDS, and reiterated that Stage II adaptation activities need to be urgently undertaken, in the context of the preparation of second national communications and, more importantly, for the development of demonstration projects ("learning-by-doing") that will contribute to the early identification and subsequent implementation of viable Stage III activities.
2. Participants urged AOSIS Member States to begin identifying specific activities that will define Stage II and Stage III adaptation, taking into account Articles 4.1(d) and 4.1(e) of the FCCC, relevant IPCC publications on adaptation, the UNFCCC Secretariat's list of coastal adaptation technologies, and the recent "framework" developed by UNDP-GEF for capacity building for Stage II adaptation, as platforms from which to develop specific adaptation activities at the national and/or regional levels, in an integrated approach within sustainable development strategies.
3. Participants agreed that the UNFCCC's fourth Conference of the Parties (COP4) had taken the first step in providing guidance to the GEF in decision 2/CP.4, which, *inter alia*, calls on the GEF to meet the agreed full costs of implementing

Stage II adaptation activities. They also called on the GEF to further elaborate the concept of "agreed full costs," and be more flexible with its application.

4. Participants reiterated that Stage II adaptation activities should be country-driven and should build on the work done at the national level either in the preparation of the national communications or in-depth national studies. Existing national initiatives should also be given consideration in this regard. In highlighting the importance of the regional approach for the implementation of Stage II adaptation activities, participants noted its contribution to the successful implementation of Stage I activities, and called for the use of regional expertise and organizations, where appropriate, and for the use of national mechanisms where this is feasible or preferable to the national authorities.
5. Participants recommended that, given the importance of adaptation to the implementation of the commitments of all Parties, contained in Article 4.1 of the Convention, the sixth session of the UNFCCC's Conference of the Parties adopts a decision on guidance to the GEF that calls for the provision of financial resources (agreed full costs) to developing country Parties, in particular the least developed and the small island developing States amongst them, to enable AOSIS Member States to begin implementing Stage II activities and to develop demonstration projects aimed at identifying and subsequently implementing viable options for Stage III adaptation activities.

SIDSNet

1. Participants welcomed recent developments on SIDSNet, which included the provision of funds from a small number of donor countries. They expressed concern with the proposal by UNDP to relocate SIDSNET to a developed country and reaffirmed the AOSIS decision that SIDSNET should remain at United Nations headquarters in New York.
2. Participants, in reaffirming the importance of SIDSNet to SIDS and to the implementation of BPOA, strongly endorsed the proposal to relocate SIDSNET from UNDP to the SIDS Unit of UNDESA, and called upon the Chairman of AOSIS to present this recommendation to the Administrator of UNDP and to the Under-Secretary-General of UNDESA, with a view to ensuring a smooth and immediate transition of SIDSNET to the SIDS Unit of UNDESA.
3. Participants identified a number of tasks for SIDSNet. These include:

(a) Assisting SIDS in the identification of short/long-term capacity needs through coordination with the regional institutions;
(b) Dissemination and promotion of a number of tools, such as V&A, GIS, and serving as a virtual site for ongoing capacity development in these areas;
(c) Serving as a repository for various sources of relevant information, documents and expertise of AOSIS Member States; case study profiles were seen as important additions to this process.
(d) Enhancing cooperation between regional organizations and with AOSIS Member States, in accordance with the mandates of the organizations and on availability of resources.

4. Participants recommended that an updated and revised directory of SIDS Experts be made available through SIDSNet, categorized by country, region and area of expertise. This would assist AOSIS Member States in accessing expert advice and assistance for a variety of capacity development and technical assistance needs. Participants noted the contribution that had been made by TCDC Unit of UNDP

(SIDSTAP – SIDS Technical Assistance Program), and recommended that this task be taken up by SIDSNet in its transition over to the SIDS Unit of UN DESA. SIDSNet should also standardize assist these States with the coordination of data collection and monitoring to allow for more uniform reporting on SIDSNet, which in turn would allow for ease of comparison between countries and regions. The SIDS Unit of UNDESA should assist SIDSNet in this, in cooperation with the relevant regional organizations.

5. Participants also recommended that SIDSNet should be strengthened to enable it to conduct ongoing virtual capacity development workshops in areas of greatest concern to AOSIS Member States, as identified in the BPOA. This will require funding through various sources, including through the CDI. The work should be coordinated through the SIDS Unit of UNDESA, and should involve the UN system and relevant regional organizations, as well as relevant institutions and programs in Member States of AOSIS.
6. Participants invited regional organizations to disseminate their current and planned programs through SIDSNet for the purpose of establishing an ongoing and programmatic approach to capacity development in AOSIS Member States, building on the appropriate regional mechanisms that may be in place.
7. Participants called for the development of a regional presence for SIDSNet, including within the regional organizations of AOSIS Member States involved in national communications. This could necessitate a full-time SIDSNet officer in each of the AOSIS regions and, as appropriate, within the regional organizations within AOSIS Member States. Specific tasks for such officers will have to be determined according to the mandates of the regional organizations, regional priorities, needs and capacities, but could include assisting the SIDS Unit of UNDESA in its work to coordinate information exchange within and between AOSIS Member States.
8. Participants agreed that the strengthening of SIDSNet activities at the national level within AOSIS Member States required urgent attention. SIDSNet will also seek to keep AOSIS Member States fully informed of progress with SIDSNet, as well as any problems encountered, as well as its future needs.
9. Participants urged SIDSNet to explore ways of providing information in languages other than English, given the diversity of the Membership of AOSIS.
10. Participants requested the Chairman of AOSIS to bring these matters to the attention of the relevant budgetary committee of the UN, with a view to incorporating into the UN regular budget, the personnel needs of the SIDS Unit and of SIDSNet to enable them to carry-out these tasks, including the costs for the full network of SIDSNet.

STRENGTHENING OF THE SIDS UNIT

1. Participants welcomed the appointment of Mr. Espen Ronneberg to the position of Inter-regional Advisor within the SIDS Unit of UNDESA, with responsibility for the coordinated follow-up of the recommendations of the 22nd Special Session of UNGA on the review of the BPOA. In this regard, participants noted with appreciation the generous contribution made by the Government of Norway to fund this position and, given the effectiveness of the Inter-regional Advisor to date, further invited that Government to continue its generous contribution on conclusion of the initial three-year period.

2. Participants invited UNDESA to ensure that the post of Inter-regional Advisor be included in the core posts of the SIDS Unit. They also called for the strengthening of the advisory and supportive roles that the Inter-regional Advisor provides AOSIS Member States in the meetings of the subsidiary bodies of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity, and strongly endorsed his continued attendance in these capacities at the meetings of the UNFCCC and the CBD, including the future meetings of the ICCP of the Biosafety Protocol, given the importance of these Conventions to the implementation of the Barbados Program of Action.
3. Participants highlighted the importance of the participation of SIDS in the recent initiatives undertaken by the GEF and the IPCC. In this regard, they strongly endorsed the participation of the Inter-regional Adviser on the Steering Committee for the GEF's IPCC/UNEP capacity-building project aimed at strengthening the participation of developing country scientists in the work of the IPCC, and on the Steering Committee for the GEF's Capacity Development Initiative, and invited the Chairman of AOSIS to communicate these recommendations to the CEO/Chairman of the GEF and the Chairman of the IPCC respectively.
4. Participants also requested the Inter-regional Advisor to continue assisting the Chairman of AOSIS with the organization, planning and execution of all AOSIS Workshops related to the Conventions and the Barbados Program of Action.

ARTICLES 4.8 AND 4.9 OF THE UNFCCC

1. Participants noted the importance of the work underway on the implementation of articles 4.8 and 4.9 of the Convention. They also noted that AOSIS views on this agenda item had been incorporated into a formal submission to the UNFCCC Secretariat for the twelfth session of the subsidiary bodies of the UNFCCC.
2. They reviewed the contents of the submission and highlighted the concern that, under Article 4.8, adaptation should follow a rigorous assessment and evaluation process, so as to avoid maladaptation, and to ensure that the adaptation proposals are environmentally sound and will produce real benefits. They also noted that adaptation should be considered as having global benefits, even if the narrow definition, currently in use, would suggest that the benefits are purely local, and in recalling that it was identified as one of the global actions (along with mitigation) in the objective of the convention, they urged that the previously narrow interpretation be replaced by one that highlights the global benefits of adaptation.
3. Participants also recalled that the AOSIS submission also addressed the issue of Article 3.14 of the Kyoto Protocol, and that the most important consideration is for the actions that Annex 1 Parties should take to implement their policies and measures (PAMS), is to ensure that their PAMS are environmentally sound and comprehensive and that they reduce emissions. They highlighted the fact that any future consideration of funding or insurance should be on the basis of a discussion on the adequacy of these Annex 1 PAMS, and ON whether the Annex 1 countries are indeed implementing fully the Kyoto Protocol, which in turn would determine *whether or not accelerated efforts in the area of adaptation are required.*
4. Participants noted that the workshops organized so far by the UNFCCC Secretariat have highlighted the continuing inability of experts and Parties to adequately and convincingly make the case on negative impacts of response measures. They also noted that AOSIS experts who have studied the matter have only observed positive outcomes from measures which have being taken. They

further added that, to date, there have not been any factual reports on so-called "negative impacts," and that the issue of seeking to minimize impacts had only been addressed by only one study presented to the workshops.

5. Participants were of the view that the debate on this issue of negative impacts of response measures was not yet timely, and urged that efforts be concentrated on implementing what are already commitments under the Convention. In this regard, AOSIS Member States were of the view that priority should be given to the implementation of the provisions of Article 4.9, which addresses the needs of the least developed countries.

6. Participants noted that the AOSIS submission identified a number of initial actions that should be implemented in accordance with Articles 4.8 and 4.9 of the Convention, through the provision of adequate financial resources and appropriate technologies, with special consideration given to the least developed countries. They include:

a. Improving preliminary data and information gathering;
b. Providing for thematic and regional workshops on issues related to adaptation, insurance, technology and financing relevant to these articles;
c. Establishing and strengthening systematic observation and monitoring networks (sea level and climate monitoring stations), and providing training in specialized fields relevant to adaptation, such as GIS, modeling, and integrated coastal management;
d. Enhancing technical training for vulnerability assessments, climate change impact assessments across all sectors and environmental management.
e. Establishing and or strengthening regional centers for the provision of research, training, education and technical support;
f. Establishing or strengthening early warning systems for extreme weather events in an integrated and inter-disciplinary manner to suit the requirements of particularly vulnerable countries;
g. Establishing pilot or demonstration projects to show how adaptation planning and assessment can be practically translated into projects that will provide real benefits, and integrated in national policy and sustainable development planning, on the basis of the staged approach endorsed by the Conference of the Parties in its decision on national communications from non-Annex I Parties.

7. Participants were informed of the consultations to be held on this issue at the seat of Secretariat in August 2000 and urged the AOSIS Coordinator to participate actively in these consultations, with a view of ensuring that AOSIS views, in particular those on adaptation and insurance, were incorporated in the revised version of discussion text to be considered at the thirteenth session of the subsidiary bodies of the Convention in September.

ARTICLES 4.2(A) AND (B) OF THE UNFCCC

1. Participants noted that the issue of Articles 4.2 (a) and (b) still remains to be discussed fully by the COP. They noted the need for a genuine opportunity to hear the views of all Parties, to listen to all concerns and to review these articles. Participants reiterated the general view within AOSIS of disappointment that there has not been adequate or even demonstrable progress towards the objective of the Convention, and that further delay will make prospects for survival in the AOSIS

countries even more tenuous. Participants recognized that though some Annex 1 were taking some actions, it was certainly not to the extent expected from their statements made at the Conferences of the Parties. They urged that future discussions should focus on the question of why Annex 1 Parties are not doing more, when compared to the steps taken by many developing countries, who have made progress despite the very low levels of resources they have available to them. They urged that issue be resolved in the near future.

2. Participants urged Annex 1 Parties to urgently sign and ratify the Kyoto Protocol. They also noted that most AOSIS Member States have signed the Kyoto Protocol, and some have already ratified the agreement. They urged those AOSIS Member State who have not yet done so to sign and ratify the Protocol, while being cognizant of the need to close its loopholes.

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

1. Participants, in noting the valuable contribution that the IPCC has made to the understanding of the climate change process, expressed concern with the small numbers of scientists from AOSIS Member States and called for wider participation of scientists from these countries in the IPCC process, while recognizing the need to develop capacity building in the field of climate change science and appealing to the international community for assistance.
2. Participants noted and supported the proposal by SIDSNet to act as a communication source to identify training programs and scholarships that would be appropriate for AOSIS countries to meet their capacity development and institutional strengthening needs in the field of climate change science.

LAND USE, LAND USE CHANGE AND FORESTRY (LULUCF)

1. Participants noted the contribution of LULUCF activities in relation to the global carbon cycle, as well as the relevant contribution of fossil fuel burning in residual greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.
2. Participants noted that issues associated with LULUCF were relevant in relation to national inventories of Annex I countries and to project based activities. They expressed concern with attempts by some Annex I countries to defined LULUCF activities in a manner that could significantly affect their assigned amounts, and recommended that these proposals be studied thoroughly to ensure that they were not used as a means to enable Annex I Parties to escape or to indefinitely avoid their commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
3. Participants noted the implications of current discussions associated LULUCF as they related to the Kyoto Protocol. They expressed their appreciation for the work carried out by the IPCC on this issue, but noted that some topics associated with project based activities may need a more comprehensively assessed for their implications.
4. Participants discussed the issue of leakage and non-permanence of LULUCF project based activities and underlined their concern that projects being proposed under the Clean Development Mechanism will not properly address these issues or contribute to sustainable development.
5. Participants agreed that the concern of AOSIS Member States of their vulnerability to the adverse effects of climate change must be given primary consideration in any decision associated with LULUCF.

MECHANISMS

1. Participants noted the very serious implications to the environmental integrity of the Kyoto Protocol in general, and to increases in Annex I Parties' emissions in particular, that the mechanisms could have, unless potential loopholes are closed. They stressed the need to continue to press for domestic action within Annex I Parties as the Protocol's primary goal.
2. Participants highlighted the fact that the sheer complexity of the issues relating to the mechanisms creates communication problems and contributes to the lack of public awareness at all levels.
3. Participants discussed the main areas of concern to AOSIS Member States, and the various alternatives that have been included in the consolidated draft text of the Chairman of the contact group on the Kyoto Mechanisms. They noted that a number of AOSIS were listed among the alternatives. These include: the AOSIS participation in Executive Board, transparency, eligibility of projects under the CDM, share of proceeds, the significant uncertainties relating to sinks, and the adaptation fund.
4. Participants recommended that AOSIS continue to press for a seat on the CDM Executive Board, and for a composition reflecting a majority of developing country participation, and reiterated the call for the CDM's institutions should function in a transparent manner.
5. Participants noted the importance of ensuring that the projects funded by the CDM were country driven, supported sustainable development and could meet the needs and concerns of AOSIS members. The possible use of a "positive list" of project types or technologies was discussed. Participants recommended that assessing the desirability of such a list would require further thought and the assistance of AOSIS technical experts in ensuring that it would prioritize projects and technologies of use to AOSIS countries and would contribute to their sustainable development. Nevertheless, they reaffirmed the group's position that nuclear energy should not be included in the CDM.
6. Participants recalled the central role that AOSIS delegations had played in ensuring that the CDM activities could generate funds for adaptation through the application of an adaptation surcharge. They stressed the need to ensure that such a surcharge generated significant funds without decreasing the CDM's attractiveness vis-a-vis the Protocol's other mechanisms. They firmly support the position adopted by the G77 and China that the surcharge should be applied to the other mechanisms of the Protocol.
7. Participants discussed the need to ensure that any "Adaptation Fund" established to distribute the proceeds collected would be governed and managed in a manner that AOSIS Member States' needs to achieve sustainable development.
8. The Participants noted with concern the proposals by some countries to channel adaptation funding to those countries receiving the largest amount of CDM investments. They strongly rejected these arguments and stressed that countries most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change should be the priority recipients of adaptation funding.

COMPLIANCE

1. Participants noted the valuable contribution that AOSIS has made to the development of the compliance regime within the Convention process. They reaffirmed the positions reflected in past AOSIS submissions on compliance, which stressed the need for a strong, effective, and transparent compliance system authorized to enforce "binding consequences" against Annex I Parties that have failed to meet their emissions reductions commitments.
2. Participants pledged to concentrate their efforts in the joint working group on compliance, and to strengthen AOSIS' participation in the negotiations on this crucial issue.
3. Participants highlighted the need for AOSIS Member States to be represented on the Expert Review Teams and on any new bodies established under the compliance regime. They stressed the need for developing country Parties to be accorded the right to trigger the compliance procedure, and called for an open, transparent and manageable compliance regime, that will assure AOSIS Member States that the Annex 1 Parties are in fact meeting their obligations under the Kyoto Protocol.
4. Participants recalled the essential relationship between compliance and the mechanisms and in particular the need for the compliance system to ensure the integrity of emissions trading and joint implementation. To this end, they supported the use of the compliance system to prevent any Annex I party, which fails to meet eligibility criteria, from participating in the mechanisms.
5. The Participants underscored the need for further discussions on the design of appropriate "binding consequences" and on the various proposals by a number of developed countries for a "compliance fund" and for a "compliance action plan." They recommended that these proposals be studied thoroughly to ensure that they were not used as a means to enable Annex I Parties to escape or to indefinitely avoid their commitments to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

ENERGY

1. Participants noted that the use of woody biomass as the dominant source of fuel for household energy contributes, in some cases, quite significantly to deforestation in a number of AOSIS Member States. They also noted the negative impacts on health from woody biomass fuel. Recognizing the links between deforestation, loss of biological diversity and land degradation, participants recommended that a goal of AOSIS should be the immediate identification of options for more sustainable domestic energy provision. They also noted that there are numerous valuable project ideas in the field of producing fuel oils from vegetables and coconuts, and that these resources should be included in the considerations of the energy issue.
2. Participants recognized that waste (solid and sewage) represents a potential source of energy through the application of appropriate technological conversion systems (anaerobic fermentation and gasification). The noted with concern the negative impacts on marine ecosystem caused by the disposal of untreated waste, including the effects on coastal biodiversity. In this regard, they recommended that AOSIS Member States, in consultation with relevant regional institutions, organizations and donor countries, initiate a process aimed at identifying and acquiring the technology conversion systems to help meet their energy needs, and reduce environmental damage.

3. Participants, in highlighting the important linkages between energy services, economic development and global climate change, called for the development of a comprehensive process to review the energy sector of AOSIS Member States with a view to identifying those energy policies that are consistent with sustainable development principles and resources management, and which could serve as guidelines for all States.

4. Participants called on AOSIS Member States to take a more proactive role in the ninth session of the Commission on Sustainable Development in 2001, in an effort to ensure that consideration is given to the development of an energy-focused agenda. Such an agenda should be aimed at the implementation of renewable energy, new and alternative energy, and energy efficiency policies and projects, which would contribute significantly to the reduction of GHG emissions, reduce the amount spent on the importation of fossil fuels, thereby increasing the amount available for national economic development, and assist AOSIS Members States in achieving sustainable development. They also stressed the need for demonstration projects to be presented at the CSD.

5. Participants recognized that the regional institutions of learning have a significant role to play in assisting AOSIS Member States with the identification and acquisition of appropriate renewable energy technologies, and new and alternative energy technologies, as well as a supportive role in the implementation of renewable energy policies and projects. Participants also highlighted the need for focused information on renewable energy issues to be more readily available, and that in this regard SIDSNet could be approached for assistance.

6. Participants expressed support for the proposal of the use of Ocean Thermal Energy Conversion (OTEC) technology as an option for AOSIS Member States to provide energy services, potable water and raw materials for mariculture production. They welcomed the approval by the GEF Council of the recommendation of its scientific body, GEF STAP, that this option be included in the list of GEF-supported renewable energy technologies. In this regard, they commended the current GEF initiative aimed at the developing on a commercial scale, OTEC projects in the Caribbean and Pacific regions, and called on the World Bank-GEF and the project proposer to intensify their efforts to ensure speedy development of the projects.

7. Participants noted that the transportation sub-sector is the fastest growing source of GHG emissions, and urged AOSIS Member States to seek funding from the GEF for projects aimed at developing alternative means of transportation, with a priority on electric vehicles.

8. Participants welcomed the capacity building initiative by AOSIS to convene, with the assistance of the SIDS Unit of UNDESA and Professor Albert Binger of UWICED, a Workshop on Energy for Sustainable Development, to be held in Cyprus in January 2001. The Workshop is aimed at assisting AOSIS Member States in developing unified, coherent and pragmatic policy decisions that would be conducive to a more enlightened outcome of the ninth session of the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development. The workshop should also begin to give direction to the needs for institutional strengthening within the AOSIS regions. Participants invited the Chairman of AOSIS, with the assistance of Professor Binger and the SIDS Unit of UNDESA, to begin preparations for the workshop.

9. Participants noted that the workshop should seek to highlight the linkages to all the vital sectors of the SIDS economies and to keep the social and human development aspects of energy questions in SIDS, including public education and awareness. The workshop should also seek to have demonstration projects presented to participants, and should seek to address investment risks and financial issues related to energy projects development, such as project formulation and implementation.

10. Participants endorsed the approach of commissioning specific, short, focused background papers identifying the latest developments, issues and options for AOSIS Member States, which will form the basis for the substantive part of the workshop. In this regard, they welcomed the coordinating/consulting role to be played by Prof. Binger, utilizing terms of reference to be developed in consultation with Chairman of AOSIS, in the preparation of the background papers and assisting with the organization of the workshop, in cooperation with the SIDS Unit of DESA and relevant organizations from the AOSIS regions. Prof. Binger was requested to provide a document that outlines the linkages between energy and the various sectors such as tourism, industry and agriculture, as well as the linkages to the sustainable development problems facing SIDS.

11. Participants requested the Chairman of AOSIS to seek the necessary financing from all sources, including through the use of any surpluses left over from the present workshop (and here the kind understanding of the Government of Italy was requested in order to facilitate, on a expedited basis, such a request), in order for work to commence immediately on the planning and execution of the Workshop, and to ensure adequate representation by AOSIS experts and negotiators in this the 3rd AOSIS Workshop.

ANNEX: MAIN FINDINGS OF THE WORKING GROUPS ON NATIONAL COMMUNICATIONS

PRIORITIES IN THE NATIONAL COMMUNICATION PROCESS

	ISSUE	DESIRED OUTCOME	PROPOSED ACTION
1.	Strengthen coordination and support mechanisms	- Functional and sustainable national climate change teams - Regional support mechanisms - Intra-regional networking	- Apply for GEF Top Up - Strengthen national policy and legislative frameworks - Initiative at regional governmental level - Technical information exchange and sharing
2.	Regional climate scenarios for V&A Assessments	- Use Global Circulation Models and other available scenario generators to simulate regional impacts of climate change	- Ensure decision at COP6
3.	Socio-economic and sector-specific modeling	- Ability to analyse evolution of socio-economic trends - Ability to analyse impact on specific sectors e.g. agriculture, water, tourism.	- Follow-up on NCSP initiative currently underway - Assess available models at national and regional levels for applicability - Develop new models where necessary with appropriate technical assistance e.g. NCSP, using sector specialists - Strengthen data collection systems to generate data required by models
4.	V&A capacity building	- Ability to conduct complete national V&A Assessments	- Training through NCSP and other relevant institutions

	ISSUE	DESIRED OUTCOME	PROPOSED ACTION
5.	Awareness and Education	- Availability of relevant materials for use at national and regional levels	- Access and assess available materials through inter-regional and intra-regional networking - Network and share materials, where appropriate - Develop indigenous material, preferably at a regional level
6.	"SIDS-Friendly" GHG Models	- Refining of IPCC GHG methodology re emission factors and scale of units used to report emissions	- Approach IPCC re refining scale of units re appropriateness for SIDS - Develop regional emission factors using regional expertise e.g. universities - Assess utility of emission factors and disseminate

What were the main benefits of the regional approach:

- Many issues were fairly well identified and addressed by the national communications process, but some areas were identified as having been given insufficient detail and coverage to adequately meet the needs of the country and the communities. While inventories were fairly complete, the scale of the tables confirmed that emissions were low, and hence not the real priority for the countries. V and A studies on the other hand could have been more detailed. While these were a good starting point, they did not include enough socio-economic issues, were not adequate on the different sectors, and were not sufficiently accurate to provide direction for future policy planning and projects development.
- The country teams have been able to discuss mutual problems, through discussions at workshops and email interaction.
- Has PICCAP resulted in the establishment of the appropriate structures at the national level to deal with climate change issues – it is a good beginning but the future direction leads to uncertainties. A lot has been achieved, but momentum must continue.

What were the main difficulties:

- PICCAP was not entirely designed by the region, and coordinators were brought in after the project was adopted. PICCAP has been modified over the three years, but remains an evolving learning process for all involved. If the present participants had designed PICCAP today, it would have been very different.
- Project profiles should have been developed within the national communications, but few were.
- Time constraints have been difficult, as well as capacity problems.
- Food security, agriculture and fisheries needs to be placed in the climate change context, and could have been given better coverage. This would also address the issue of overlap between the implementation of different conventions.
- Many sectors such as water resources management would probably be too site-specific for regional cooperation, while others such as agriculture may have enough similarities to allow regional projects.
- IPCC format is not too SIDS user friendly, and there may be scope to establish own format for SIDS.
- V and A guidelines under IPCC are not clear enough to allow major funding from the GEF to adaptation projects, and need to be get better and more concrete steps that can be implemented for SIDS right now.
- NGOs must be enabled to have access to the relevant climate change information, accessible in a manner and format that is comprehensible.
- Data must be available within the countries that require it, not just in data centers in the industrialized countries. Also regional organizations with data should be better at sharing this with interested SIDS.
- V and A and GHG training was too short for such complex issues.
- Regional and international institutions were not communicating adequately with each other, or with the country teams, and there were several competing influences on the PICCAP process.

What are the recommendations for improvement:

- Effectiveness of delivery of information and training to the grassroots level must be addressed, as well job security and continuity of the climate change teams. Personnel will require continuous updated training as international guidelines and reporting requirements are changed over time.
- Appropriate information and support to SIDS, through adequate supporting machinery, such as regional organizations, SIDSNet, UN agencies, etc., especially in highly technical areas.
- Adequate information and support to be able to establish projects in the identified priority areas.
- Information sharing with the other SIDS and between communities within SIDS.
- Implementation into the education system to allow for a fully integrated input to the human resource development.
- Need to move beyond the clarion call, but to actually get the attention towards other complimentary sustainable development in the SIDS.
- Lack of data to allow for a more meaningful use of the models, while at the same time there are few models actually usable for the SIDS context. The models should either be adapted or modified so that they can be of more practical use to SIDS. Cooperation with international experts and with other SIDS is needed.
- PICCAP has not produced any real projects as outcomes of the national communications process, and this must be addressed as a practical requirement for the next PICCAP phase. This could involve the country teams in the interim phase looking at the national communication and finding project opportunities to develop further.
- There is a need to increase political acceptance of the climate change priorities at the national level to ensure consistency and complimentarity, and avoid counter-productive policy decisions. This would also enable countries to lobby the international community with a firmer resolve.
- The regional framework developed at Rarotonga and the suggested roundtable approach for its implementation and oversight could be integrated into an international supporting framework, using the expertise of other SIDS and organizations, and taking advantage of available financial support.
- Financial and technical support must be strengthened in the next round of PICCAP.